Macroscopic non-classical state preparation via post-selection

Víctor Montenegro,[1,*] Raúl Coto,[1] Vitalie Eremeev,[2] and Miguel Orszag[1]

[1] *Instituto de Física, Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile, Casilla 306, Santiago, Chile*
[2] *Facultad de Ingeniería, Universidad Diego Portales, Santiago, Chile*

(Dated: December 13, 2016)

Macroscopic mechanical qubits are fundamental both to test the classical-quantum boundary and present suitable candidates for quantum information processing. Motivated by these, we propose a feasible probabilistic scheme to generate an on-demand mechanical qubit, as well as Schrödinger's cat and Fock number states. In order to accomplish this proposal, we study an open dispersive spin-mechanical system in the absence of any external driving. The procedure is solely based on spin post-selection in the weak coupling regime. Through this scheme we demonstrate that the achieved superposition is closely related to the amplification of the mean values of the mechanical quadratures as they are associated to the maximum quantum coherence.

PACS numbers: 42.50.Dv, 03.65.Aa, 03.65.-w, 03.67.-a, 03.65.Yz

arXiv:1612.03198v1 [quant-ph] 9 Dec 2016

Introduction.— In the late 1920s, non-relativistic Quantum Mechanics (QM) was ultimately formulated to encompass the understanding of the microscopic as well as the macroscopic world [1, 2]. However, singular quantum states have not been yet found at a macroscopic scale due to both the large number of interacting particles and decoherence of the degrees of freedom involved. For instance, even nowadays, states such as quantum superposition and Schrödinger's cat are extremely challenging to observe at large scale. In contrast, over the last decades, preparation and control of macroscopic quantum states have attracted serious attention in the quantum information science, particularly towards the universal quantum computer, where some tasks are difficult (or impossible) to realize with classical technology [3–7]. Thus, non-classical macroscopic states are an outstanding resource to grasp theoretical aspects of quantum theory and also a key ingredient for quantum information applications.

The question then arises. How can one be able to generate non-classical states at a macroscopic scale? Typically, the best candidates by default are quantum harmonic oscillators (quantized electromagnetic field or a massive object); a building block of QM which can inherently interact with a wide variety of physical systems, such as trapped ions [8], cavity-QED [9, 10], ultracold atomic Bose-Einstein condensate [11, 12], quantum dots or Cooper-pair boxes [13–16], superconducting qubits coupled to superconducting resonators [17–19], opto-mechanical systems [20, 21], etc., where a resonant (or quasi-resonant) interaction takes place, relying on the exchange of excitations between systems (Jaynes-Cummings and beam-splitter interaction), external driving and commonly operating in the strong (or ultrastrong [22–24]) coupling regime.

In the past few years, there have been remarkable advancements in the development of accurate quantum control and preparation of non-classical macroscopic mechanical states in different hybrid platforms as cavity/circuit QED [25–29], opto- and nano- mechanics [30–38], trapped ions [8], etc. Generally the Schrödinger's cat states are intensively pursued and found in various setups, but this is not the case with the Fock states of the mechanics, which are more challenging to obtain on-demand (see for example Refs. [25, 29, 33, 34, 39]).

In this Letter, we present a feasible scheme to prepare non-classical states of a macroscopic mechanical object. The scheme comprises an on-demand qubit (0 and 1 phononic states) superposition, a Schrödinger's cat state and the generation of a single Fock number state (n=1). To realize this goal, we have considered an open spin-mechanical quantum system via a conditional displaced interaction Hamiltonian in the dispersive regime without any need for adjusting resonances. Therefore, in comparison with previous works on the matter [40–42], our proposal does not rely on any non-linearity, energy exchange nor external pumping. Moreover, in contrast to cavity photons, spin systems exhibit both long coherence as well as depolarization times at room temperature. They also can be easily prepared and read-out [43, 44]. Our probabilistic preparation protocol is uniquely based on two steps. Firstly, we weakly evolve (preselect) the spin-mechanical system for a time t, allowing us to truncate the oscillator Hilbert space up to a single phonon excitation. Subsequently, we then proceed to post-select the spin system. This is a last step which is aimed to prepare (probabilistically) an on-demand mechanical qubit superposition. Our results can be understood within the clear connection between the quantum coherence [45] of the mechanics and the position and momentum quadratures amplification on average. On the other hand, Schrödinger's cat states (odd and even phonon probability distribution) are found to be generated in the strong coupling regime. Interestingly as the coupling decreases (for the same parameters of the mechanical cat state), we are able to find the n=1 (n=0) single Fock number state.

Spin-mechanical dynamics.— Let us commence by considering a single two level system (e.g., a spin qubit)

coupled dispersively to a macroscopic mechanical harmonic oscillator. This elementary spin-mechanical system is described in the interaction picture by ($\hbar = 1$) $\hat{H}_{\rm int} = \hat{b}^\dagger\hat{b} - \lambda\hat{\sigma}_z(\hat{b}^\dagger + \hat{b})$, where $\lambda = \lambda_0/\omega_m$ is the scaled coupling strength, λ_0 being the direct spin-mechanical coupling interaction and ω_m the oscillator frequency; $\hat{b}$ stands for the mechanical annihilation bosonic operator. To investigate the quantum dynamics, we preselect the spin in a superposition $1/\sqrt{2}(|\uparrow\rangle + |\downarrow\rangle)$, and we initialize the mechanics in its ground state $|0\rangle$ [46].

Macroscopic mechanical qubit preparation.— In this section, we will show how a macroscopic mechanical qubit can be generated through conditioned spin post-selection in the weak-coupling regime. To assess this goal, let us recast the spin-mechanical wave-function (in absence of any source of decoherence) $|\psi(t)\rangle = 1/\sqrt{2}(|\uparrow\rangle|\lambda\eta\rangle + |\downarrow\rangle|-\lambda\eta\rangle)$ as previously reported in [47]; $\eta = (1 - e^{-it})$. Firstly, we truncate the mechanical coherent states $|\pm\lambda\eta\rangle$ up to their first phononic number state, i.e., $|\pm\lambda\eta\rangle \approx 1/\sqrt{1+|\lambda\eta|^2}(|0\rangle \pm \lambda\eta\,|1\rangle)$, approximation valid for $|\lambda\eta| = \lambda\sqrt{2(1-\cos t)} \ll 1$. This operational regime can be addressed, for instance, via magnetic coupling. There the interaction can be explicitly written as $\hbar\lambda_0 \approx \mu_B\partial B/\partial z\sqrt{\hbar/2m\omega_m}$ [48], where for a set of values of $\mu_B \sim 10^{-23}$ J/T (Bohr magneton), mass $m \sim 10^{-14}$ kg, mechanical frequency $\omega_m \sim 10^6$ Hz, and a magnetic gradient between 10^4 T/m $< \partial B/\partial z < 10^7$ T/m, the coupling reduces to $10^{-4} < \lambda < 10^{-1}$.

Subsequently, a second crucial step is to post-select the spin. To attain this, let us consider a target spin as $|\psi_f\rangle = \cos(\theta/2)|\uparrow\rangle + \sin(\theta/2)e^{i\phi}|\downarrow\rangle$. Thus the wave-function after the post-selection becomes

$$|\psi(t)\rangle_m \approx \frac{1}{\mathscr{N}\sqrt{2(1+|\lambda\eta|^2)}}(\alpha_+|0\rangle + \lambda\eta\alpha_-|1\rangle) \quad (1)$$

where, $\alpha_\pm = \cos(\theta/2) \pm e^{-i\phi}\sin(\theta/2)$ and $2\mathscr{N}^2(1 + |\lambda\eta|^2) = (1 + \sin\theta\cos\phi + |\lambda\eta|^2(1 - \sin\theta\cos\phi))$. From Eq. (1) one could easily notice that a combination of weak spin-mechanical coupling and spin post-selection can lead to an on-demand mechanical qubit superposition. Particularly, for an equiprobable superposition, e.g., $|\langle 0|\psi(t)\rangle_m|^2 = |\langle 1|\psi(t)\rangle_m|^2 = 1/2$, we require

$$|\lambda\eta|^2(1 - \sin\theta\cos\phi) = 1 + \sin\theta\cos\phi. \quad (2)$$

The above equation stands as one of the main results of our work, as it relates the spin-mechanical dynamics with the required post-selection angles to prepare the mechanics. It can be interpreted as following, if we let our system to evolve for a time t (such as $\lambda\sqrt{2(1-\cos t)} \ll 1$), then the balanced mechanical superposition will occur if and only if $\{\theta, \phi\}$ satisfies (2), or vice-versa.

At this stage, we have successfully achieved the macroscopic $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$ superposition via spin post-selection (see Eq. (2)). However, the above derivation is restricted to a lossless evolution in a truncated Hilbert space. Thus, it is of our best interest, to investigate the robustness of our scheme in a more realistic scenario. To model this we have solved the spin-mechanical master equation in Lindblad form within the Born-Markov approximation for a reservoir at zero temperature. In this specific case the master equation reads as $d\hat{\rho}/dt = -i[\hat{H}_{\rm int}, \hat{\rho}] + \gamma/2(2\hat{b}\hat{\rho}\hat{b}^\dagger - \hat{\rho}\hat{b}^\dagger\hat{b} - \hat{b}^\dagger\hat{b}\hat{\rho})$, where γ (scaled by ω_m) is the mechanical damping rate. Following the alternate-step procedure described in [49], one can calculate the normalized spin-mechanical density matrix as following $\hat{\rho} = \frac{1}{2}(|\uparrow\rangle\langle\uparrow| \otimes \hat{\Pi}_{++} + |\uparrow\rangle\langle\downarrow| \otimes \hat{\Pi}_{+-} + |\downarrow\rangle\langle\uparrow| \otimes \hat{\Pi}_{-+} + |\downarrow\rangle\langle\downarrow| \otimes \hat{\Pi}_{--})$, where we have defined

$$\hat{\Pi}_{\pm\mp} = e^{-\Gamma^\gamma_{\pm\mp}(t)}\,|\beta_\pm(\gamma,t)\rangle\,\langle\beta_\mp(\gamma,t)|\,, \quad (3)$$

$$\hat{\Pi}_{\pm\pm} = |\beta_\pm(\gamma,t)\rangle\,\langle\beta_\pm(\gamma,t)|\,, \quad (4)$$

$$\beta_\pm(\gamma,t) = \pm 2i\lambda\frac{(\gamma-2i)}{\gamma^2+4}\left(1 - e^{-\frac{1}{2}(\gamma+2i)t}\right), \quad (5)$$

$$\Gamma^\gamma_{\pm\mp}(t) = -\frac{\gamma}{2}\int_0^t |\beta_\pm(\gamma,t') - \beta_\mp(\gamma,t')|^2 dt'. \quad (6)$$

Under mechanical damping, the normalized mechanical state after the spin post-selection becomes

$$\hat{\rho}_m = \frac{\cos^2\frac{\theta}{2}\hat{\Pi}_{++} + \sin^2\frac{\theta}{2}\hat{\Pi}_{--} + \frac{\sin\theta}{2}(e^{i\phi}\hat{\Pi}_{+-} + h.c)}{2\mathscr{P}(\theta,\phi)}, \quad (7)$$

$2\mathscr{P}(\theta,\phi) = 1 + \sin\theta\,\mathrm{Re}[e^{-D^\gamma_{+-}(t)}e^{i\phi}\,\langle\beta_-(\gamma,t)|\,\beta_+(\gamma,t)\rangle]$. $\mathscr{P}(\theta,\phi)$ being the probability to post-select the spin.

To exhibit the mechanical superposition, let us calculate the phonon probability distribution ($\Pr(n) = \langle n|\,\hat{\rho}_m\,|n\rangle$) obtained from Eq. (7)

$$\Pr(\mathrm{n}) = \frac{4^n e^{-4c_1\lambda^2}(c_1\lambda^2)^n}{2\mathscr{P}(\theta,\phi)n!}[1 + \sin\theta\cos\phi e^{c_2\lambda^2}(-1)^n]. \quad (8)$$

A reasonable approximation will be to consider the lossless solution in Eq. (2) $\{\theta_s, \phi_s\}$, where the s label reads for an equal superposition satisfying $\Pr(n = 0) = \Pr(n = 1) \approx 1/2$. For simplicity and without loss of generality, we have chosen $t = \pi$, thus $c_1 = (e^{-\frac{\pi\gamma}{2}} + 1)^2/(\gamma^2+4), c_2 = 8e^{-\pi\gamma}(4e^{\frac{\pi\gamma}{2}}\gamma^2 + \gamma^2 - e^{\pi\gamma}(-3\gamma^2 + \pi(\gamma^2+4)\gamma + 4) + 4)/(\gamma^2+4)^2$. In Fig. 1, we show the mechanical qubit (equally superposed) by plotting $\Pr(n)$ (8) in the general open case considering the spin post-selection angles computed from Eq. (2).

As known, $\Pr(n = 0) = \Pr(n = 1) \approx 1/2$ are not sufficient conditions for quantum superposition by themselves, as fully mixed classical states can have the same associated probabilities. To evidence the quantumness of our preparation, in Fig. 1-b, we have numerically computed the Wigner quasi-probability distribution defined as $W(x,p) = \frac{1}{\pi}\int_{-\infty}^{\infty}\langle x + x'|\,\hat{\rho}_m\,|x - x'\rangle\,e^{-2ipx'}dx'$ [50], the true quantum nature arises as a consequence of the considerable negative part of $W(x,p)$.

Furthermore, one may wonder whether we can set an upper bound of the weak coupling condition $|\lambda\eta| \ll 1$.



FIG. 1. (Colour online) Generation of a macroscopic mechanical qubit. (a) The slight unbalance in the superposition Δ_γ is due to the presence of energy losses, where $\Delta_\gamma = 0$ for the unitary evolution. (b) We show the Wigner function to evidence the quantum superposition. In (c) we calculate $\Pr(n)$ for $n = 2$ and $n = 3$. As seen, for any $\lambda \leq 0.25$ the mechanical qubit remains quite robust. Other parameters are $t = \pi, \gamma = 0.01, \lambda = 0.1$, and $\{\theta_s, \phi_s\}$ are solution of (2).



FIG. 2. (Colour online) (Top panel) Quadratures on average after post-selection and the mechanical coherence as in Eq. (9) for different ϕ_s. The superposition is achieved when coherence is maximal for a set of post-selected angles $\{\theta_s, \phi_s\}$ satisfying (2) (vertical dashed line). (Bottom panel) Outcome post-selected probability $\mathscr{P}$ for the same angle window. Other parameters are $t = \pi, \gamma = 0.01, \lambda = 0.05$.

Certainly, the above ensure that the mechanical Hilbert space is properly truncated up to just one single phonon number state. However, we can fine tune this assumption up to $\lambda \leq 0.25$, where $\Pr(n = 2) \approx 1.4\%$, as it is shown in Fig. 1-c. The benefits of having stronger coupling interactions are to increase the post-selection outcome probability $\mathscr{P}(\theta, \phi)$, and also as λ increases, then the balanced superposition becomes less susceptible to $\{\theta_s, \phi_s\}$ fluctuations. Suitable coupling candidates are found to be in the range of $0.05 < \lambda < 0.2$ with a spin post-selection probability on average of $2\% < \mathscr{P}_{\rm av} < 24\%$, respectively.

Moreover, due to the mechanical energy losses, we have included $\Delta_\gamma \neq 0$ in the main panel of Fig. 1 (for $\gamma = 0$ then $\Delta_\gamma \to 0$) to show qualitatively that, if γ increases then the mechanics tends to its ground state. Particularly, we have numerically found a critical damping rate of the order of $\gamma = 0.01$. In other words, $\gamma \leq 0.01$ will not strongly deteriorate the mechanical qubit preparation. Typical values of γ are far below 10^{-2}, hence our proposal is suitable even against mechanical energy losses [35, 51].

The generated mechanical qubit in our work can be understood in the context of quantum coherence. As known, in quantum optics, it is well established that two or more quantum states of a single mode can interfere with themselves if they have non-zero coherence. Recently, in the domain of the quantum information science, this feature have also been demonstrated of being related with the amount of quantum entanglement [52]. For our purpose, given any matrix $\hat{\rho} = \sum_{\{i,j\}=0}^{N} \rho_{i,j} |i\rangle \langle j|$ we define the quantum coherence as $\mathscr{C} = \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} |\rho_{n,n+1}|$ [45], where for $|\psi\rangle = \sum_{n=0}^{N} \frac{1}{\sqrt{N+1}} |n\rangle$ then $\mathscr{C}_{\rm max} = \frac{N}{2}$ (for $t = 0$). On the other hand, we can also calculate the average of the position and momentum quadratures as $\langle\hat{x}\rangle = \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} {\rm Re}[\rho_{n,n+1}]\sqrt{n+1}$ and $\langle\hat{p}\rangle = -\sum_{n=0}^{N-1} {\rm Im}[\rho_{n,n+1}]\sqrt{n+1}$, respectively (for $[\hat{x}, \hat{p}] = \frac{i}{2}$). From the above, it is straightforward to obtain (for our truncated mechanical qubit case, i.e., $N = 1$)

$$\mathscr{C} = |\langle 0|\hat{\rho}_m|1\rangle| = \sqrt{\langle\hat{x}\rangle^2_{\rm post} + \langle\hat{p}\rangle^2_{\rm post}}. \qquad (9)$$

This expression relates quantum coherence with the mechanical properties that we can, in principle, extract from an experiment (for $N \neq 1$ the relationship between the mechanical properties and coherence is harder to derive). In addition to this, Eq. (9) shows the impossibility to generate a mechanical qubit superposition by its quantum evolution alone, as the expectation values are always zero in this case. Also, a post-selection on the $\hat{\sigma}_z$ eigenstates does not generate the amount of coherence required for a qubit superposition, as $\langle\pm 2\lambda|\hat{x}|\pm 2\lambda\rangle = \pm 2\lambda, \langle\pm 2\lambda|\hat{p}|\pm 2\lambda\rangle = 0$ (see discussion below).

In the top panel of Fig. 2, we plot the mechanical coherence, the mean values of the position and the momentum quadratures. There, we show three cases corresponding to three different ϕ_s angles, where the coherence reaches approximately its maximal value ($t = \pi$ and $\gamma = 0.01$) for its corresponding θ_s, and it coincides with i) the maximum of $\langle\hat{x}\rangle_{\rm post}$ ($\langle\hat{p}\rangle_{\rm post} = 0$), ii) the maximum of $\langle\hat{p}\rangle_{\rm post}$ ($\langle\hat{x}\rangle_{\rm post} = 0$), and iii) a combination of both, respectively. This is confirmed as well by Eq. (9). In the bottom panel of Fig. 2 we have plotted their associated probabilities, where for $\lambda = 0.05$ then $\mathscr{P}_{\rm av} \approx 2\%$.

At this point, we would like to stress the high resemblance of our preparation protocol with the weak-

measurement theory by Aharanov, Albert & Vaidman (AAV) [53]. The combination of a weak interaction and pre/post-selection are shown to lead to an anomalous effect (explained shortly after by Duck et. al. [54]), namely the weak value amplification (WVA) [53].

In our model one has the main ingredients (weak coupling and pre/post-selection) of the AAV theory, therefore it is interesting to see if any amplification phenomena occur. To identify the oscillator amplification, we propose to compare the quadrature mean values obtained by post-selection measurement $(\langle\hat{x}\rangle_{\rm post}, \langle\hat{p}\rangle_{\rm post})$ with those obtained by considering the σ_z eigenstates, i.e. $\langle\pm\lambda\eta|\hat{x}|\pm\lambda\eta\rangle = \pm\lambda(1-\cos t), \langle\pm\lambda\eta|\hat{p}|\pm\lambda\eta\rangle = \pm\lambda\sin t$ —similarly as in a recent work in optomechanics [55]. Therefore, we define the position and momentum amplification's factors as $\mathbb{Q} \equiv |\langle\hat{x}\rangle_{\rm post}|/|\pm\lambda(1-\cos t)|$ and $\mathbb{P} \equiv |\langle\hat{p}\rangle_{\rm post}|/|\pm\lambda\sin t|$, which could evidence the mechanical amplification in our approach. If these quantities are $\{\mathbb{Q},\mathbb{P}\} > 1$ then clearly the effect of the qubit post-selection is to amplify the quadratures on average. It can be seen from Fig. 2 that there are some cases (mechanical qubit superposition) where i) the position quadrature is amplified up to a factor of $\mathbb{Q} \equiv 0.5/(2\times 0.05) = 5$ (and the momentum is not), ii) the momentum quadrature is amplified $\mathbb{P} \equiv 0.5/(2\times 0.05) = 5$ (and the position is not), and iii) a combination of both. However, we can not identify the above amplification with the original WVA, since in our case the AAV approximation breaks down [54].

Mechanical single Fock preparation.— In this section, we will briefly explore our protocol in the strong operational regime. From the wave-function $|\psi(t)\rangle = 1/\sqrt{2}(|\uparrow\rangle|\lambda\eta\rangle + |\downarrow\rangle|-\lambda\eta\rangle)$, a direct consequence from the dispersive spin-oscillator coupling is to lead the mechanics into a non-classical macroscopic superposition as λ increases, i.e., a mechanical Schrödinger's cat state as shown in Fig. 3-a. This could be easily seen from Eq. (8), particularly, for the given values $\{t=\pi, \phi=0, \beta=0\}$ and in absence of any source of decoherence ($c_1=1, c_2=0$) then $\Pr(n) \approx e^{-4\lambda^2}\lambda^{2n}(1+\sin\theta(-1)^n)$. Hence a simple choice of the post-selected angle, e.g., $\theta = \pm 3\pi/2$ we can generate an odd (or even) phonon number distribution.

Interestingly, in Fig. 3-b, we show that as λ decreases we can prepare the oscillator into a single Fock number state $n=1$ ($n=0$), being a consequence of the odd (even) phonon distribution for small coherent amplitude. Moreover, one may wonder if we are able to generate n-number state, however, as our system does not rely on energy exchange, but on coherent displacement of the mechanics, we can not prepare such a state.

Lastly, although we are able to prepare the mechanics into a single phonon Fock state with a high fidelity of production, to post-select the qubit in the weak-coupling regime becomes hard to achieve. This could be easily seen as one proceed to post-select the qubit into the state, e.g., $\{\theta = 3\pi/2, \phi = 0\}, |\psi\rangle_f = 1/2(-|\uparrow\rangle + |\downarrow\rangle)$. Thus the target qubit becomes more and more orthogonal



FIG. 3. (Colour online) a) Mechanical Schrödinger's cat state for $t=\pi, \phi=0, \theta=3\pi/2, \gamma=0.01$ and $\lambda=1$. b) As a consequence of decreasing the coupling, a single Fock number state $n=1$ for the same set of parameters is generated.

with the initial preparation. Of course, for $\lambda \to 0$ then the outcome probability $\mathscr{P}$ decreases rapidly to zero, as the mechanics disentangles from the spin. Despite of the above, considering a coupling of, let us say $\lambda = 0.1$, then the Fock state $n=1$ is prepared with a probability of $\mathscr{P}_{\rm av} = 3.8\%$ on average.

Concluding remarks.— We proposed a feasible method to generate an on-demand macro-mechanical qubit, as well as Schrödinger's cat and single Fock number states ($n=1$) for the oscillator. In contrast to previous works [40–42], we studied an open dispersive spin-mechanical system without any spin and/or mechanical driving, where our proposal is uniquely based on spin post-selection in the weak coupling regime.

To understand the mechanical qubit superposition, we derive a correspondence between the amplification of the mechanical quadratures on average and the maximum value of the quantum coherence —whereas the single Fock number state responds as a direct consequence from low-amplitude Schrödinger's cat states.

Finally, from an experimental point of view, our setup shows a fine probability of production on average $2\% < \mathscr{P}_{\rm av} < 24\%$ for $0.05 < \lambda < 0.2$, respectively. We also demonstrate that the achieved states are robust against detrimental effects due to mechanical energy losses.

V.M. and R.C acknowledge the financial support of the projects Fondecyt Postdoctorado #3160700 and #3160154, respectively. M.O. and V.E. acknowledge the financial support of the projects Fondecyt #1140994. We have benefited from comments of S. Bose and J. Maze.

* vmontenegro@fis.puc.cl

[1] D. J. Wineland, Rev. Mod. Phys. **85**, 1103 (2013).
[2] J. Friedman and S. Han, *Exploring the Quantum/classical Frontier: Recent Advances in Macroscopic Quantum Phenomena* (Nova Science, 2003).
[3] S. Lloyd, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 167902 (2003).
[4] G. Brassard, Foundations of Physics **33**, 1593 (2003).
[5] H. J. Kimble, Nature **453**, 1023 (2008).

[6] D. Deutsch, Proceedings of the Royal Society of London A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences **400**, 97 (1985).
[7] D. P. DiVincenzo, D. Bacon, J. Kempe, G. Burkard, and K. B. Whaley, Nature **408**, 339 (2000).
[8] R. Blatt and D. Wineland, Nature **453**, 1008 (2008).
[9] J. M. Raimond, M. Brune, and S. Haroche, Rev. Mod. Phys. **73**, 565 (2001).
[10] H. Walther, B. T. H. Varcoe, B.-G. Englert, and T. Becker, Reports on Progress in Physics **69**, 1325 (2006).
[11] P. Treutlein, D. Hunger, S. Camerer, T. W. Hänsch, and J. Reichel, Phys. Rev. Lett. **99**, 140403 (2007).
[12] D. Hunger, S. Camerer, T. W. Hänsch, D. König, J. P. Kotthaus, J. Reichel, and P. Treutlein, Phys. Rev. Lett. **104**, 143002 (2010).
[13] K. Hennessy, A. Badolato, M. Winger, D. Gerace, M. Atature, S. Gulde, S. Falt, E. L. Hu, and A. Imamoglu, Nature **445**, 896 (2007).
[14] G. A. Steele, A. K. Hüttel, B. Witkamp, M. Poot, H. B. Meerwaldt, L. P. Kouwenhoven, and H. S. J. van der Zant, Science **325**, 1103 (2009).
[15] A. D. Armour, M. P. Blencowe, and K. C. Schwab, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 148301 (2002).
[16] S. Bose and G. S. Agarwal, New Journal of Physics **8**, 34 (2006).
[17] I. Chiorescu, P. Bertet, K. Semba, Y. Nakamura, C. J. P. M. Harmans, and J. E. Mooij, Nature **431**, 159 (2004).
[18] A. Wallraff, D. I. Schuster, A. Blais, L. Frunzio, R.-S. Huang, J. Majer, S. Kumar, S. M. Girvin, and R. J. Schoelkopf, Nature **431**, 162 (2004).
[19] J. Clarke and F. K. Wilhelm, Nature **453**, 1031 (2008).
[20] M. Scala, M. S. Kim, G. W. Morley, P. F. Barker, and S. Bose, Phys. Rev. Lett. **111**, 180403 (2013).
[21] Z.-q. Yin, T. Li, X. Zhang, and L. M. Duan, Phys. Rev. A **88**, 033614 (2013).
[22] A. L. Grimsmo and S. Parkins, Phys. Rev. A **87**, 033814 (2013).
[23] S. Ashhab and F. Nori, Phys. Rev. A **81**, 042311 (2010).
[24] J. Hausinger and M. Grifoni, Phys. Rev. A **82**, 062320 (2010).
[25] C. K. Law and J. H. Eberly, Phys. Rev. Lett. **76**, 1055 (1996).
[26] P. Nataf and C. Ciuti, Phys. Rev. Lett. **107**, 190402 (2011).
[27] J.-M. Pirkkalainen, S. U. Cho, J. Li, G. S. Paraoanu, P. J. Hakonen, and M. A. Sillanpaa, Nature **494**, 211 (2013).
[28] A. Reiserer, N. Kalb, G. Rempe, and S. Ritter, Nature **508**, 237 (2014), letter.
[29] A. D. O'Connell, M. Hofheinz, M. Ansmann, R. C. Bialczak, M. Lenander, E. Lucero, M. Neeley, D. Sank, H. Wang, M. Weides, J. Wenner, J. M. Martinis, and A. N. Cleland, Nature **464**, 697 (2010).
[30] S. Bose, K. Jacobs, and P. L. Knight, Phys. Rev. A **59**, 3204 (1999).
[31] W. Marshall, C. Simon, R. Penrose, and D. Bouwmeester, Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 130401 (2003).
[32] D. Vitali, S. Gigan, A. Ferreira, H. R. Böhm, P. Tombesi, A. Guerreiro, V. Vedral, A. Zeilinger, and M. Aspelmeyer, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 030405 (2007).
[33] B. Pepper, R. Ghobadi, E. Jeffrey, C. Simon, and D. Bouwmeester, Phys. Rev. Lett. **109**, 023601 (2012).
[34] C. Galland, N. Sangouard, N. Piro, N. Gisin, and T. J. Kippenberg, Phys. Rev. Lett. **112**, 143602 (2014).
[35] M. Aspelmeyer, T. J. Kippenberg, and F. Marquardt, Rev. Mod. Phys. **86**, 1391 (2014).
[36] A. Carmele, B. Vogell, K. Stannigel, and P. Zoller, New Journal of Physics **16**, 063042 (2014).
[37] J. Bochmann, A. Vainsencher, D. D. Awschalom, and A. N. Cleland, Nat Phys **9**, 712 (2013), letter.
[38] O. Arcizet, V. Jacques, A. Siria, P. Poncharal, P. Vincent, and S. Seidelin, Nat Phys **7**, 879 (2011).
[39] R. Riedinger, S. Hong, R. A. Norte, J. A. Slater, J. Shang, A. G. Krause, V. Anant, M. Aspelmeyer, and S. Gröblacher, Nature **530**, 313 (2016), letter.
[40] R. W. Heeres, B. Vlastakis, E. Holland, S. Krastanov, V. V. Albert, L. Frunzio, L. Jiang, and R. J. Schoelkopf, Phys. Rev. Lett. **115**, 137002 (2015).
[41] S. Krastanov, V. V. Albert, C. Shen, C.-L. Zou, R. W. Heeres, B. Vlastakis, R. J. Schoelkopf, and L. Jiang, Phys. Rev. A **92**, 040303 (2015).
[42] M. Miskeen Khan, M. Javed Akram, M. Paternostro, and F. Saif, arXiv:1606.03690v2 , (to be published in Phys. Rev. A) (2016).
[43] E. van Oort, N. B. Manson, and M. Glasbeek, Journal of Physics C: Solid State Physics **21**, 4385 (1988).
[44] L. Robledo, L. Childress, H. Bernien, B. Hensen, P. F. A. Alkemade, and R. Hanson, Nature **477**, 574 (2011).
[45] T. Baumgratz, M. Cramer, and M. B. Plenio, Phys. Rev. Lett. **113**, 140401 (2014).
[46] D. D. B. Rao, S. A. Momenzadeh, and J. Wrachtrup, Phys. Rev. Lett. **117**, 077203 (2016).
[47] V. Montenegro, A. Ferraro, and S. Bose, Phys. Rev. A **90**, 013829 (2014).
[48] P. Treutlein, C. Genes, K. Hammerer, M. Poggio, and P. Rabl, "Hybrid mechanical systems," in *Cavity Optomechanics: Nano- and Micromechanical Resonators Interacting with Light*, edited by M. Aspelmeyer, T. J. Kippenberg, and F. Marquardt (Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2014) pp. 327–351.
[49] S. Bose, K. Jacobs, and P. L. Knight, Phys. Rev. A **56**, 4175 (1997).
[50] J. Johansson, P. Nation, and F. Nori, Computer Physics Communications **184**, 1234 (2013).
[51] S. Camerer, M. Korppi, A. Jöckel, D. Hunger, T. W. Hänsch, and P. Treutlein, Phys. Rev. Lett. **107**, 223001 (2011).
[52] A. Streltsov, U. Singh, H. S. Dhar, M. N. Bera, and G. Adesso, Phys. Rev. Lett. **115**, 020403 (2015).
[53] Y. Aharonov, D. Z. Albert, and L. Vaidman, Phys. Rev. Lett. **60**, 1351 (1988).
[54] I. M. Duck, P. M. Stevenson, and E. C. G. Sudarshan, Phys. Rev. D **40**, 2112 (1989).
[55] G. Li, T. Wang, and H.-S. Song, Phys. Rev. A **90**, 013827 (2014).